The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Studemund's *Anecdota Varia Anecdota Varia Graeca et Latina*, ediderunt Rud. Schokll et Guil. Studemund, Volume I. Berlin 1886. 10 Mk.

C. B. Heberden

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 06 / June 1889, pp 262 - 263
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00195162, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00195162

How to cite this article:

C. B. Heberden (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 262-263 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00195162

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

put together. Now Mr. Papageorgius constantly improves away these most valuable marks. e.g. in *Ajax* 38 he inserts a δέ to join into one two distinct scholia, and reads ἐν τοῖς ἀμοιβαίοις κατὰ βραχὺ δηλοῦνται ἡ ὑπόθεσις, πυνθάνεται <δὲ> πρῶτον εἰ ἄρα πρὸς καιρὸν πονῶ. εἰ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ὁ τὸν φόνον δράσας πρὸς καιρὸν ἂν εἴη πονῶν ὁ Ὀδυσσεύς. Again on *O.R.* 89 he would omit a most eloquent ὅτι. The scholium runs ἐστὶν δὲ ποῖον τοῦπος; : ὅτι ἀσαφὴ τὸν λόγον εἶπεν [ὅτι] ἀξιοῖ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ῥητοῦ ἀκοῦσαι. Here any one with any knowledge of scholia sees at once that we have two old notes (possibly each an explanation of the same editorial mark) run together into one sentence as is constantly being done by the later scribes. Yet the last editor would deprive us of one means of

separating the explanation ὅτι ἀσαφὴ τὸν λόγον εἶπεν from the explanation ὅτι ἀξιοῖ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ῥητοῦ ἀκοῦσαι. Similarly on *Ant.* 18 ἦδεν καλῶς : ἀντὶ τοῦ ἦδεα καὶ ἦδεν σε καλῶς τὰ τοιαῦτα μὴ πολυπραγμονοῦσαν he asks us to omit the καί. But what is to be said of the condition of mind of an editor who would strain at this gnat of a particle and swallow the camel ἦδεν in the lemma?

These instances do not stand alone. Similar mistakes and misconceptions may be found not only on every page, but almost in every paragraph. If scholia are as this editor represents them to be, there is nothing to be gained by preserving them, but on the contrary they had better be entirely neglected.

W. GUNION RUTHERFORD.

STUEMUND'S *ANECDOTA VARIA*.

Anecdota Varia Graeca et Latina, ediderunt
RUD. SCHOELL et GUIL. STUEMUND,
Volume I. Berlin 1886. 10 Mk.

THE very miscellaneous contents of this volume fall mainly under three divisions according as they deal with metre, music or mythology. The first of these forms the larger and more important part of the book, and of this the most valuable portions are the contributions to the study of the Scholia on Hephaestion. In the *Rheinisches Museum* vol. xxxvi pp. 260 ff. it was shown by Hoerschelmann that a commentary on Hephaestion which in the MSS. exists in the form of a continuous treatise had hitherto been concealed in the editions of the *ἑλληνολεξικόν* amongst the Scholia, in a fragmentary and dismembered condition. This commentary, which Hoerschelmann attributes to Choeroboscus, he has published in this volume, with a collation of three MSS., only one of which, the Bodleian 'Saibantianus,' was known to Gaisford. The other two MSS., a Venetian and a Vatican, have been for the first time collated by Studemund. The Saibantianus appears to be a copy of the Venetian MS.; the Vatican is independent and differs considerably from the others. There is little, if anything, in this first complete edition of the commentary which was not already known, for the greater part had been already published in the form of extracts by Gaisford and the remainder contains no new information of any real

importance. The value of the edition is partly that it is based on a careful collation of good MSS., and partly that it throws a new light on the composition of the heterogeneous Scholia to Hephaestion, and so on the history of metrical tradition.

The commentary is followed by an edition by Studemund of the so-called 'Scholia A' based on a collation of three MSS., viz. an Ambrosian MS. of the end of the 13th or beginning of the 14th century (called by Studemund A), the Venetian MS. already mentioned, and an Ambrosian MS. of the 15th century (called by Studemund Q). The Venetian MS. appears to be a copy of A, which in the opinion of Studemund is the best of the existing MSS. of Hephaestion. As Hoerschelmann had already edited the 'Scholia B' (Dorpat 1882) there are now complete critical editions of all the Scholia to Hephaestion, based on good MSS., and thus an important beginning has been made towards the edition of a '*corpus metricorum Graecorum*' which has been promised by Hoerschelmann and Studemund. In another chapter Studemund gives the readings of A in all the quotations from the poets made by Hephaestion in the *ἑλληνολεξικόν*, but the more important of these had been already communicated by Studemund to Bergk for the third edition of the '*Lyrici Graeci*.' He also gives the readings of A in the 'Scholia B' where it differs from the Harleian MS. (O) collated by Hoerschelmann for his edition. These various readings

however do not supply any improvement of Hoerschelmann's text.

The remainder of the metrical portions of the volume consists of *anecdota* from various MSS. on various subjects. In these there is frequent repetition, and the information furnished by them is for the most part either already familiar, or of little value. The chief subjects dealt with are the following:—the 'κωνή συλλαβή,' synizesis, the different kinds and names of feet, the commonest metres, such as dactylic hexameters, elegiacs, iambics, anacreontics, the different forms of the hexameter according to the number and varying positions of the dactyls and the spondees, the different kinds of hexameters which are in appearance metrically defective, the various caesuras. One of these anonymous writings (contained in an Ambrosian MS.) gives a list of names for different metrical combinations of five and six syllables, which suggests some corrections in the text of the similar list of pentasyllabic "feet" given by the Latin grammarian Diomedes. It is supplemented by another list of pentasyllabic and hexasyllabic 'feet' (which however is of little value) extracted from a Berlin MS. and printed in the addenda. Interspersed with these metrical 'anecdota' are some of a lexicographical character, the most considerable being a list of Greek words for

the cries of animals, which is given in slightly different forms from several MSS.

The musical portion of the volume consists of an edition by Adolf Stamm of three very short Greek treatises (from a Laurentian MS.) containing *καταρμαὶ κανόνος*, i.e. divisions of the string into the lengths required for producing different notes in the scale. The editor has printed the text of the MS. and also a corrected text accompanied by translations both in Latin and in German, a critical and exegetical commentary, and an account of the various instruments used by the ancient theorists for measuring the ratios corresponding to the different concords and discords. The text of the first of these *καταρμαὶ* is very corrupt, but it has been corrected by the editor (with the assistance especially of C. von Jan) with great ingenuity, and in most cases with almost absolute certainty.

The mythological section consists of Greek lists of the epithets applied to the twelve chief deities, i.e. Zeus, Apollo, Poseidon, Ares, Dionysus, Hephaestus, Hermes, Athene, Hera, Aphrodite, Demeter, Artemis, edited by Studemund from three different but closely connected sources. In these lists will be found several epithets which appear to be otherwise unknown.

C. B. HEBERDEN.

DUFF'S LUCRETII, BOOK V.

T. Lucreti Cari de Rerum Natura Liber Quintus. Edited with Introduction and Notes by J. D. DUFF, M.A. Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Cambridge, at the University Press. 1889. 2s.

THIS school edition of the fifth book of Lucretius does not make any claim to original treatment of the text or matter. It will however be found exceedingly useful by beginners who are not advanced enough to use Munro's notes. The introduction gives a brief and clear account, without going into any debatable ground, of what is known of the poet's life, of the general scope of the poem and its position in Latin literature, especially in relation to Virgil: an outline of the Epicurean philosophy abridged from Zeller; and a section explaining the more simple terms of astronomy so far as they are treated of in the book. The text generally follows Munro's

last edition. The notes are very full and careful, too full indeed to leave much to the discretion or invention of the teacher. What amount of help in notes is desirable in a schoolbook is a question mainly for schoolmasters to decide: but there can be no doubt that this edition, if it errs, errs on the side of over-copiousness and leaving too little to the schoolboy's intelligence. A few examples of unnecessary notes will make it plain what I mean. After rightly saying on l. 139 'that *videri* often requires, and usually can bear, the meaning 'be seen' in Lucr., Mr. Duff goes on, the first time only ten lines later, and thereafter almost as often as the word occurs (I have counted eight instances) to repeat '*videtur* is passive.' The term *boves Lucas* explained on l. 1302 is surely striking enough to remain in even an average schoolboy's mind till he gets to l. 1339. Sometimes needless translations are given: '*exitium*, utter destruction,' '*consilio*,